

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,552	04/09/2004	Stanislav I. Svetlov	61641(49163)	1304	
	7590 01/31/2008 JGELL PALMER & DOD	EXAMINER			
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874			WANG, CHANG YU		
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1649		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/31/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/821,552	SVETLOV ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Chang-Yu Wang	1649			

	Chang-Yu Wang	1649	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the followalces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliantime periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, wh g date of the final rejecti	ichever is later. In on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origor than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exterm a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause
(a) \boxtimes They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			Ale territoria
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) ☐ winded below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	,		
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5-11,15 and 18.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>12-14</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration has been consideration has been consideration. See Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for	allowance
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:	CHRISTINE J. SAOUD PRIMARY EXAMINER	/CYW/	
·	Christine) Saoud		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Application No. 10/821,552

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: a) Because the claims have been amended (i.e. free of FGF2 and EGF) so the scope of the invention is changed and because the claims encompass new limitations, further search and/or consideration is required. Thus, the amendment does not simplify the issues of the rejections and further does not place the application in better condition for appeal or allowance.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are insufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103(a). Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindquist et al. (US2004/0014662,published Jan 22, 2004, priority date Jul 2, 2002 as cited in Paper No. 20061113) in view of Steindler et al. (US 6638763, issued on Oct 23, 2003, priority Jan 7, 1997). The rejection is maintained for the reasons made of record in the office action mailed on 8/3/07 as directed to the previously presented claim limitations. Applicant's amendment filed on 1/3/08 has not been entered. Thus, the arguments directed to claim amendments not entered are currently moot.

/CYW/ 1/22/08

CHRISTINE J. SAOUD

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mustine D. Saoud